75

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
07-694 NOV 20 2007
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

(1)

In the

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Todd Guthrie

Petitioner,

v.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Respondent.

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari
to the United States Court of Appeals for
the Ninth Circuit

WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Todd Guthrie
1434 Ayer Lane
Mt. Shasta, CA 96067

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Does the dully enacted Paperwork Reduction Act of both 1980 and as strengthened, the 1995 Paperwork Reduction Act, and all of its protections for the public, apply to the Secretary's request for income tax information promulgated through request Form 1040 for year ending 2002?

2. If so, does the request for income tax information comply with 44 U.S.C. §§§ 3506(c)(1)(B), 3507 and 3512(a)(1995)?

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

The caption contains the names of all parties in the case below.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....1

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION.....1

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS.2

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....2

REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT TO CIRCUIT.....4

1. Does the dully enacted Paperwork Reduction Act of both 1980 and as strengthened, the 1995 Paperwork Reduction Act, and all of its protections for the public, apply to the Secretary's request for income tax information promulgated through request Form 1040 for year ending 2002?.....4

2. If so, does the request for income tax information comply with 44 U.S.C. §§§ 3506(c)(1)(B), 3507 and 3512(a)(1995).....17

CONCLUSION.....24

APPENDIX

Memorandum Tax Court.....App. 1

Judgment Tax Court.. .....App. 6

9th Circuit Memorandum.....App. 8

9th Circuit Judgment.....App.10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cheek v. U.S., 498 U.S. 192, 199-200 (1991).....19

CIR v. Lane-Wells Co., 321 U.S. 219, 223 (1944) ...18

Dole v. United Steelworkers, 494 U.S. 26,43 (1990) 1,4,5,23,24

Pond v. CIR, T.C. Memo 2005-255, WL 18928 decided 10911-02 (10th.Circuit 1-4-07)(unpublished) 7

Saco River Cellular, Inc., v FCC, 133 F. 3d 25,31 (D.C. Cir. 1998) 19

U.S. v. Bentson, 947 F.2d 1353 (9th Cir. 1991).13,24

U.S. v. Collins, 920 F.2d 619, 630-31 in footnote 12,... 11

U.S.v. Chisum, 06-7082, decided September 25, 2007 (published).....7,9,10

U.S. v. Hicks, 947 F. 2d 1356, 1359 (9th cir. 1991), ...1,3,4,9,20,24

U.S. v. Hubbell, 530 U.S. 27, 35 (2000).....18

U.S. v. Mersky, 361 U.S. 431, 437 (1960).....19

U.S. v. Tedder, 787 F.2d 540, 542 (10th Cir. (1986).....8

U.S. v. Weiss, 914 F.2d 1514, 1520-22 (2d Cir. 1990).....11

STATUTES INVOLVED

26 U.S.C. § 151(d).....3

26 U.S.C. § 6011.....3,19

26 U.S.C. § 6012.....3

26 U.S.C. § 6651.....2

26 U.S.C. § 6654.....2

44 U.S.C. § 3502(14).....6

44 U.S.C. § 3506(c)(1)(b).....2,14,16,17

44 U.S.C. § 3507.....16,17

44 U.S.C. § 3512.....6,13,16,17

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

P.L. 104-13(1995), pg. 206-207 USCCAN.....15,22

Revenue Ruling 2006-21.....21

5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3).....16,17

5 CFR 1320.6(e).....20

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Todd Guthrie respectfully requests that a writ of certiorari be issued to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, reversing its decision, as well as setting aside its decision in *United States v. Hicks*, 947 F. 2d 1356, 1359 (9th cir. 1991), as it is clearly contrary to this Court's decision in *Dole v. United Steelworkers of America*, 494 U.S. 26, 33(1990) which held tax forms were typical information requests subject to the protection of the Paperwork Reduction Act of then 1980.

OPINIONS BELOW

The decision of the United States Tax Court was entered May 1, 2006. The Panel decision was entered August 23, 2007.

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

The judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was final August 23, 2007.

Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

CONSTITUTION AND STATUTES

At issue 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq and penalties and interest claims pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §§ 6651(a)(1) and 6654(a).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On April 5, 2005, Respondent subjected Petitioner to claims of penalties and interest for failing to provide income tax information on or before April 15, 2003 for the Calender year 2002 on request for income information form 1040 with OMB # 1545-0074.

Petitioner timely Petitioned the Tax Court raising a defense during the administrative process and any judicial action applicable thereto seeking protection from the interest and penalty claims of Respondent based upon the undeniable fact the request Form 1040 does not comply with 44 U.S.C. §§§ 3506(c)(1)(B), 3507 and 3512.

Petitioner's defense also drew attention to the undisputed fact that no where in the Internal Revenue Code did Congress provide an exempt amount adjusted according to 26 U.S.C. § 151(d) which any determination under 6012 would need be based.

Between 26 U.S.C. § 6012's defects for calender year 2002 regarding § 151(d) and § 6011's failure to bring into compliance any request for income information adhering to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Petitioner sought protection.

Respondent claimed the exempt amount for section 6012 was not required to be written by Congress and the Form 1040 did not need comply with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 citing to the mandate by statute, not by regulation theory discussed in *United States v. Hicks*, 947 F. 2d 1356, 1359 (9th cir. 1991) wherein the 9th Circuit rejected this Court's holding to the contrary in *Dole v. United Steelworkers of*

America, 494 U.S. 26, 33(1990)

The Tax Court held Hicks controls and the IRS is exempt from the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995[1] and imposed the penalties and interest Respondent subjected Petitioner to in its Notice of Deficiency.

Petitioner appealed and a panel of the 9th Circuit affirmed citing to its holding in *United States* v. *Hicks*, 947 F. 2d 1356, 1359 (9th cir. 1991).

This Writ of Certiorari follows.

ARGUMENT SUPPORTING GRANTING OF WRIT

1 The dully enacted Paperwork Reduction Act of both 1980 and as strengthened, the 1995 Paperwork Reduction Act, and all of its protections for the public, apply to the Secretary's request for income tax information promulgated through request Form 1040 for year ending 2002 as held in *Dole v. United Steelworkers of America*, 494 U.S. 26, 33(1990) and contrary to the discussion in *United States* v. *Hicks*, 947 F. 2d 1356, 1359 (9th cir. 1991).

---

[1]Even though Hicks was based upon the 1980 version of the PRA.

The Tax Court, Respondent, and United States Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit have decided to dangerously oppose this Court's decision in *Dole v. United Steelworkers of America*, 494 U.S. 26, 33(1990) which held tax forms were "typical information collection requests" subject to the protection of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980.

The 1040 "instruction booklet" for 2002 says to Petitioner "You are not required to provide information on an information request form subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act unless the form displays a valid OMB control number."

At issue here is the meaning and application of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 and whether the protection provided the public by Congress therein under 44 U.S.C. §3512 applies to penalties and interest Respondent subjected Petitioner to by way of its Notice of Deficiency dated April 5, 2005.

Congress defined penalty at 44 U.S.C. §3502(14) (1995) to mean "the imposition by an agency or court of a fine or other punishment; a judgment for monetary damages or equitable relief..."

The 1995 Paperwork Reduction Act was enacted to strengthen the 1980 Act at issue in *Dole*. The 1995 Act mandates:

> (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, **no person shall be subject to any penalty** for failing **to comply with a collection** of information that is subject to this subchapter if
>
> > (1) the collection of information does not display a valid control number assigned by the Director in accordance with this subchapter; or
> >
> > (2) the agency fails to inform the person who is to respond to the collection of information that such person is not required to respond to the collection of information unless it displays a valid control number.

(b) **The protection provided by this section may be raised** in the form of a complete defense, bar, or otherwise **at any time during the agency administrative process or judicial action applicable thereto.**

See 44 U.S.C. § 3512. See also, *Pond v. CIR*, T.C. Memo 2005-255, WL 18928 decided 10911-02 (10th.1-4-07)(unpublished); See also *U.S.v. Chisum*, 06-7082, decided September 25, 2007 (published).

The Supreme Court in *Dole* said that "While the grammar of this text can be faulted, its meaning is clear: the public is protected under the Paperwork Reduction Act from paperwork regulations not issued in compliance with the Act, only when those regulations dictate that a person maintain information for an agency or provide information to an agency."*Dole* at 40

The changes to the public protection provision in 1995 removed "fails to maintain and provide" and added "fails to comply..."

26 U.S.C. § 6011 says:

> "When required by regulation prescribed by the Secretary any person made liable for any tax imposed by this title, or with respect to the collection thereof, shall make a return or statement **according to the forms and regulations** prescribed by the Secretary."

In U.S. v. Hicks, 947 F. 2d 1356, 1359 (9th cir. 1991) created the mandate by statute override to the public protection provision which reads "notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty...".

In *U.S. v. Collins*, 920 F.2d 619, 630-31 the 10th Circuit stated:

> "In *United States v. Tedder*, 787 F.2d 540, 542 (10th Cir. 1986), this court held that tax forms were not information collection requests subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act because the filing of income tax returns was obligatory. **This holding is superseded by the Supreme Court's analysis in Dole v. United Steelworkers, ___ U.S. ___, 110 S.Ct. 929, 933, 108 L.Ed.2d 23 (1990), which**

included federal income tax forms within the category of information collection requests under the Act. Dole would also appear to call into question the holdings in *Snyder v. IRS*, 596 F. Supp. 240 (N.D.Ind. 1984) and *Cameron v. IRS*, 593 F. Supp. 1540 (N.D.Ind. 1984), aff'd 773 F.2d 126 (7th Cir. 1985), both of which held the Paperwork Reduction Act inapplicable to IRS forms. However, Dole does not contravene our recent holding in Lonsdale v. United States, 919 F.2d 1440, 1444 (10th Cir. 1990) that IRS summonses do not constitute information requests under the Act because they are issued in the course of an investigation directed against a specific individual or entity. See 44 U.S.C. § 3518(c)(1)(B)(ii)"

The 10th Circuit recently rendered its to be "published" decision in *U.S.v. Chisum*, 06-7082, decided September 25, 2007, where the Panel[2] addressed whether the Paperwork Reduction Act reached the making of false statements by

---

[2]Same Panel who wrote the unpublished decision in Pond on January 4, 2007 cited above.

saying:

> C. The Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)
>
> The PRA, 44 U.S.C. § 3501-20, precludes the imposition of any penalty against a person for "failing to comply with a collection of information" if either (1) it "does not display a valid control number" or (2) the agency fails to alert the person that he or she "is not required to respond to the collection of information unless it displays a valid control number." 44 U.S.C. § 3512(a). A § 3512(a) defense may be raised at any time. See id. § 3512(b). Tax forms are covered by the PRA. See Dole v. United Steelworkers of Am., 494 U.S. 26, 33 (1990).
>
> Mr. Chisum contends that "[s]ince there was no proof that Form 1040 was a lawful form under the [PRA], the trial court erred in failing to grant [his] request [at the sentencing hearing] to dismiss the indictment." Aplt. Br. at 29. But the PRA protects a person only "for failing to file information. It does not protect one who files information which is false."

> Collins, 920 F.2d at 630 n.13 (internal quotation marks omitted). The charges against Mr. Chisum were predicated on the filing of false information, not the failure to file. He is therefore not entitled to relief.

Chisum, pg 12

The *Collins* footnote referred to in the Panel decision in *Chisum* states:

> "In *United States* v. *Weiss*, 914 F.2d 1514, 1520-22 (2d Cir. 1990), the Second Circuit held that the Paperwork Reduction Act did not preclude prosecution for filing false medicare and Medicaid claims, despite the fact that the forms in question did not contain OMB control numbers. Distinguishing Smith, where defendants were prosecuted for failure to file a Plan of Operations with the Forest Service, the Second Circuit reasoned that the Act "`only protects a person from penalties for failing to files information It does not protect one who files information which is false.'" Id. at 1522 (quoting Funk, The Paperwork Reduction Act: Paperwork Reduction Meets Administrative Law,

> 24 Harv.J. on Legis. 1, 77 n. 411 (1987)) (emphasis in original). We recognize that because defendant was charged with tax evasion and not failure to file tax returns, he technically was not being prosecuted for failure to provide information. Had defendant's tax evasion been effectuated through the filing of falsified tax returns, Weiss would dictate that no Paperwork Reduction Defense would be available to him. But because the provision of information in 1040 forms is inexorably linked to the statutory requirement to pay taxes, and **defendant failed to file such forms, the Paperwork Reduction Act was applicable to such conduct**."

Yet, the Government argues and the Tax Court and Panel accepted the position that because of the discussion by the 9th Circuit in Hicks, which was a criminal case, that such a discussion renders this Court's "holding" in Dole moot. The Government and Courts are simply overlooking the phrase judicial action in section 3512 as well as the term "penalty" defined at

3502(14)(1995).

In *U.S. v. Bentson*, 947 F.2d 1353 (9th Cir. 1991), decided the same day as *Hicks*, the 9th Circuit "held that the public protection provision of the PRA, 44 U.S.C. § 3512, constitutes no defense to prosecution under 26 U.S.C. § 7203. Bentson's PRA argument is essentially the same as the argument we rejected in Hicks, and we find no merit in it." *Bentson*, at 1355. The *Bentson* Court discussed what Mr. Bentson pointed out with the 10th Circuit's decision in *United States v. Collins*, 920 F.2d 619, 630-31, fn. 12-13 (10th Cir. 1990), which suggested "that persons charged with criminal violations of the Internal Revenue Code might in some circumstances legitimately raise a PRA defense. For reasons given in *Hicks*, the Bentson Court stated they "believe that the PRA was not intended to provide such a defense, and therefore we disagree with the Collins court's dicta." *Bentson*, at 1355

Except for 1995 when the Government shut

down, the IRS application each year for approval or an amended application each year, must ask permission to request income tax information from the public. Since at least 1995, Congress, at 44 U.S.C. §3506(c)(1)(B) directs the Director of OMB to "ensure" the IRS application's attached proposed request for income tax information form displays the following criteria:

> (i) inventoried, displays a control number and, if appropriate, an expiration date;
>
> (ii) indicate the collection is in accordance with the clearance requirements of section 3507; and;
>
> (iii) informs the person receiving the collection of information of;
>
> > (I) the reasons the information is being collected;
> >
> > (II) the way such information is to be used;
> >
> > (III) an estimate, to the extent practicable, of the burden of the collection;

(IV) whether the responses to the collection of information are voluntary, required to obtain a benefit, or mandatory; and

(V) the fact that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a valid control number[3]

---

[3]P.L. 104-13(1995), pg. 206-207 USCCAN- 1. "Section 3506(c) mandates a detailed information collection evaluation procedure requiring each agency to establish a process within the office designated under subsection (a), independent of program responsibility, to evaluate proposed collections. This office must: Review a collection of information before it is submitted to OMB for review, that includes making an independent evaluation of its need; preparing a description of it, a collection plan, and a burden estimate; pilot testing the collection, if appropriate; and developing a plan for the management and use of the information to be collected; Ensure that information collections are inventoried, display a control number and, when appropriate, an expiration date; indicate the collection is in accordance with the Act; and contain a statement informing the person being asked why the information is being collected, its use, its burden, and whether responses are voluntary, required to obtain a benefit, or mandatory. This requirement is transposed from current law (section 3504(c)(3)) to make it more

See 3506(c)(1)(B)(1995)

Certification is also required by the Internal Revenue Service to show compliance with 44 U.S.C. §§§ 3506,3507 and 3512, along with OMB regulations at 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3) to which each "certification" falsely states compliance with the list at 3506.

The Tax Court and 9th Circuit are simply in gross error in refusing to even acknowledge let alone enforce the holding this Court set forth in Dole that is forms such as the 1040 are subject to the public protection provision of 44 U.S.C. § 3512(a)(1995).

2. The request for income tax information 1040 for 2002 does not comply with 44 U.S.C. §§§ 3506(c)(1)(B), 3507 and 3512(a)(1995) nor does it contain what is set forth in 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3)?

---

clearly an agency responsibility, rather than a duty of OMB. Note that this requirement must also be certified to by each agency (see section 3506(c)(3)(F); and Assess the information collection burden of proposed legislation affecting the agency."

It is clear to anyone looking at the request Form 1040 for 2002 that it does not contain the list set out in 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(1)(B) nor does it comply with 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3). It simply does not contain even the basic of warning Congress demanded at 44 U.S.C. § 3512(a) and 3506(c)(1)(B)(iii)(V).

It is equally clear that "no person shall be subject to any penalty" unless the form does display a "valid OMB control number" "issued in accordance with this subchapter." See 3512(a)(1)(1995) Form 1040 is not in accordance with §§§3506, 3507 or 3512 and the Government does not dispute this fact.

The Government simply argues and the Court seams ready to accept the statutory origin theory is the basis for claiming "the filing of a tax return is required by statute, not regulation." See *Hicks*, supra

Petitioner has no difficulty putting away the

mandate by statute theory referencing first to the *Dole* Court saying "tax forms" were "typical information collection requests" subject to the PRA (of 1980), id. at 32-33; then Supreme Court in *CIR v. Lane-Wells Co.*, 321 U.S. 219, 223 (1944) stated "Congress has given discretion to the Commissioner to prescribe **by regulation forms** of returns and has made it the duty of the taxpayer to comply." The Supreme Court also in 2000 restated its conclusion in *U.S. v. Hubbell*, 530 U.S. 27, 35 (2000) that "incriminating evidence may be the by-product of obedience to a ***regulatory requirement***, such as filing an income tax return,.."

The Supreme Court also, when announcing the exception to the general definition of willfulness in criminal tax cases, said the "proliferation of statutes **and regulations** has sometimes made it difficult for the average citizen to know and comprehend the extent of the duties and obligations imposed by the tax

laws." *Cheek* v. *U.S.*, 498 U.S. 192, 199-200 (1991); See also *U.S.* v. *Mersky*, 361 U.S. 431, 437 (1960)("An administrative regulation, of course, is not a 'statute.'")

The D.C. Circuit in *Saco River Cellular, Inc.* v. *FCC*, 133 F.3d 25, 31 (D.C. Cir. 1998) held the protection provided by section 3512 precluded by "5 C.F.R. 1320.6(e)" "'does not extend to situations in which a statute authorizes, or directs, an agency to impose a collection of information on persons, and the agency does so.' Controlling Paperwork Burdens on the Public; Regulatory Changes Reflecting Recodification of the Paperwork Reduction Act, 60 Fed. Reg. 30438, 30441 (1995)."

OMB cites to section 6011 which begins "When required by regulation prescribed by the Secretary any person made liable..." The Commissioner even cites to and "their regulations" when discussing the topic with the public. The 9th Circuit explained *Hicks* was

confused between law and regulation and said:

> "It confuses law with regulations with respect to such law. It is the tax code itself, without reference to regulations, that imposes the duty to file a tax return. See *United States* v. *Bowers*, 920 F.2d 220, 222 (4th Cir. 1990) (upholding defendants' conviction under 26 U.S.C. § 7201). **However, even if we suppose that the duty to file tax returns can be understood only with reference to regulations, the IRS has duly promulgated sufficient regulations, e.g., 26 C.F.R. §§ 1.6011-1, 1.6012-1, to make that duty clear**. The meaning of 'willful failure to make a tax return' is apparent without reference to the contents of Form 1040 or its instructions."

There is no question that at best the requirement to answer the questions requested by the IRS can only be understood by reference to those questions. Those questions appear only on Form 1040 as a typical request for information. *Dole*, supra The questions which are contained within the Form 1040, do not appear in any code

provision written by Congress. This is why the IRS is required to follow the Paperwork Reduction Act application format which has a place for the IRS to inform OMB which statutory provisions they are seeking to enforce through their submission for approval of their request for information form.

On April 10, 2006, Chief Counsel for the IRS issued Revenue Ruling 2006-21 which cited to the 1980 Paperwork Reduction Act instead of the 1995 Act. The words when quoting the Act were clearly out of the 1980 Act as if the IRS refuses to acknowledge the passage of the 1995 Paperwork Reduction Act.

While addressing the reasons for the changes between the 1980 and 1995 Paperwork Reduction Acts, Congress said in its Legislative History of the 1995 PRA and its purpose for amending the 1980 PRA was to clarify that it originally was enacted to among other things, "eliminate exemptions" for the "Internal Revenue Service". *House Report, 104-13, [page 8] at 171*

(1995). App. 95 The only reason it was modified to add certain terms was to maintain consistency and clarity and to "**unequivocally cover all collections of information**." *House R. [page 54] at 217. (Emphasis added).* App.101

It is worth noting that the 1980 language of the public protection provided in section 3512 was that "no person shall be subject to any penalty for failure to maintain or provide information..." while the 1995 language says "no person shall be subject to any penalty for failure to comply with a collection of information...." Failure to maintain or provide seems more limited in scope and failure to comply seems to cover ever conceivable usage of a request for information or information obtained. Simply, if the request is out of compliance with the law, then anything obtained with that bootleg request is void. See *Dole*, 494 U.S.43 (1990)[(fn.6) Page 40 See id., at 20 (The Act "allow[s] the public, by refusing to answer these [information collection

requests], to help control `outlaw forms'")].

Likewise, the above referenced page in the "instruction booklets" for 2002 which contain the words "you are not required to provide information...." continue to this day to reference the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 instead of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

The Form 1040 does not comply with the most basic of rules set forth by Congress in the Paperwork Reduction Act of both 1980 and 1995. The requirements are mandated because most of the public does not understand the usage of information and how it is shared and in order for each person to intelligently police their rights regarding such information all requests must display compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act. The rule of law, rule of uniformity, and rule of common sense, say that a person should not be required to answer any questions posed upon it by its Government unless and until a full disclosure has occurred with regard to why the information is

being sought, how the answers will be used, whether response is optional or not, if not why not, and the fact that an agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information and a person cannot be subject to any penalty for failure to answer questions unless the request form displays a valid OMB control number issued in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

CONCLUSION

Todd Guthrie requests this Court issue Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit on the two issues raised herein and for the purpose of reversing the decision by the United States Tax Court in regard to interest and penalties along with directing the Ninth Circuit that the *Hicks* and *Bentson* decision in 1991 are in opposition to this Court's *Dole* decision in 1990 .

Respectfully Submitted

11/19/07 /s/ Todd Guthrie

T.C. Memo. 2006-89
UNITED STATES TAX COURT

TODD B. GUTHRIE,

Petitioner

v.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,

Respondent

Docket No. 12148-05. Filed May 1, 2006.

Todd B. Guthrie, pro se.

David W. Sorensen, for respondent.

MEMORANDUM FINDINGS OF FACT AND OPINION

FOLEY, Judge: By notice dated April 5, 2005, respondent determined a deficiency in and additions to petitioner's 2002 Federal income tax. The issues for decision are whether [page

2]petitioner is liable for tax relating to unreported income and for the section 6651(a)(1)1 and 6654(a) additions to tax.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Petitioner is a licensed orthopedic physician. During 2002, petitioner rendered services to Park Ridge Orthopedics, P.A., a professional medical corporation, in exchange for $255,769. Mountain Health Care, P.A., also paid petitioner $54,950 for his medical services. In addition, petitioner received $79,100 of rent, $3,601 of interest, and $150 of dividends.

Petitioner did not file a tax return or pay estimated taxes relating to 2002. As a result, respondent issued a notice of deficiency on April 5, 2005. Respondent determined that petitioner was liable for a $127,490 deficiency in income tax, a $28,685 section 6651(a)(1)[1] addition to tax

---

[1]Unless otherwise indicated, all section references are to the Internal Revenue Code in effect for the year in issue, and all Rule references are to the Tax Court Rules of

for failure to file a return, a $13,386 section 6651(a)(2) addition to tax for failure to timely pay, and a $4,260 section 6654(a) addition to tax for failure to pay estimated taxes. On July 1, 2005, petitioner, while residing in Reno, Nevada, filed his petition.

At trial, on January 30, 2006, respondent [page 3] conceded the section 6651(a)(2) addition to tax and moved for the imposition of a section 6673 penalty.

OPINION

Petitioner concedes that he received income, failed to file a return, and failed to pay estimated taxes relating to 2002. Petitioner contends that the income he received does not exceed the exemption amount set forth in section 151(b), he is not required to file a return, and he is not liable for the deficiency or the additions to tax. We sustain respondent's

---

Practice and Procedure.

determinations. The income petitioner received was taxable, and he was required to file a return. See secs. 61(a), 6012(a).

In addition, respondent bears, and has met, the burden of production with respect to the section 6651(a)(1) and 6654(a) additions to tax. See sec. 7491(c); Rule 142(a). Furthermore, petitioner does not meet the requirements of any exception to section 6651(a)(1) or 6654(a). See Higbee v. Commissioner, 116 T.C. 438, 446 (2001).

Respondent has moved, pursuant to section 6673(a), to impose sanctions. Section 6673(a) authorizes this Court to impose a penalty in favor of the United States in an amount not to exceed $25,000 whenever it appears that the taxpayer's position is frivolous, groundless, or instituted primarily for delay. See sec. 6673(a)(1)(A) and (B). Included among petitioner's contentions was a legitimate concern regarding the imposition of [page 4]a section 6651(a)(2) addition to tax. Thus, it would be inappropriate to impose a section 6673 penalty. Nevertheless, we admonish petitioner that he may be subject to a section

6673 penalty if he asserts frivolous or groundless contentions in a subsequent proceeding in this Court. Contentions we have not addressed are irrelevant, moot, or meritless.

To reflect the foregoing,

An appropriate order and

decision will be entered.

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

WASHINGTON, DC 20217

TODD B. GUTHRIE,	)	
	)	
Petitioner	)	
	)	
v.	)	Docket No. 12148-05
	)	
COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,	)	
	)	
	)	
Respondent	)	

ORDER AND DECISION

Pursuant to the Court's Memorandum Findings of Fact and Opinion (T.C. Memo. 2006-89) filed May 1, 2006, it is

ORDERED that respondent's motion to impose sanctions pursuant to I.R.C. § 6673, filed January 30, 2006, is denied. It is further

ORDERED AND DECIDED that petitioner is liable for a $127,490 deficiency in income tax, a $28,685 addition to tax, pursuant to Internal Revenue Code section 6651(a)(1), and a $4,260

addition to tax, pursuant to Internal Revenue Code section 6654(a), for the taxable year 2002.

(signed) Maurice B. Foley
Maurice B. Foley
Judge

ENTERED:

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT
No. 06-73680

TODD B. GUTHRIE,

Petitioner,

FILEDAUG 23 2007
CATHYA. CATTERSON,
CLERK U.S. Court of
Appeals for 9th Circuit

v.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,

Respondent.

Tax Ct. No. 12148-05

MEMORANDUM

Appeal from a Decision of the United States Tax Court

Submitted August 13, 2007[1][2]

Before: KLEINFELD, SILVERMAN, and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

---

[1]This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is notprecedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

[2]The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision withoutoral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2)

Todd B. Guthrie, a licensed physician, appeals pro se from the tax court's decision upholding a deficiency determination after Guthrie failed to file a tax return for tax year 2002. We have jurisdiction under 26 U.S.C. § 7482. We review a tax court'Xs legal conclusions de novo and its findings of fact for clear error. *Charlotte'Xs Office Boutique, Inc. v. Comm'Xr*, 425 F.3d 1203, 1211 (9th Cir. 2005). We affirm.

The tax court properly upheld the deficiency determination based on the Form 4340 for the year in question because Guthrie failed to present any evidence rebutting the presumption of its correctness. *See Hughes v. United States*, 953 F.2d 531, 535 (9th Cir. 1992).

We reject Guthrie's contention that he was excused from filing a tax return on the ground that 26 U.S.C. § 151(d) sets forth the amount of a personal exemption as a formula rather than a fixed amount, because this argument does not

undercut his obligation to use the formula to determine the amount of taxes owed. *See* 26 U.S.C. § 1 (setting forth basic tax rates for every income level); *see also* 26 U.S.C. § 6011 (requiring individuals liable for tax to provide a return).

We also reject Guthrie's contention that the Paperwork Reduction Act ("PRA") excuses him from filing a tax return on the ground that the Form 1040 for 2002 allegedly lacked a valid control number. *See United States v. Hicks*, 947 F.2d 1356, 1359-60 (9th Cir. 1991) (rejecting taxpayer's assertion that Form 1040's failure to comply with the PRA due to lack of a valid control number [page 2] excused his failure to file tax return). Guthrie'Xs remaining contentions are alsounpersuasive.

All pending motions are denied.

AFFIRMED.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

TODD B. GUTHRIE,

Petitioner,

v.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,

Respondent.

No. 06-73680
Tax Court No. 12148-05

JUDGMENT

Upon Petition to Review a Decision of the United States Tax Court

This cause came on to be heard on the Transcript of the Record from the United States Tax Court and was duly submitted. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the decision of the United States Tax Court in this cause be, and hereby is **AFFIRMED**.

Filed and entered Thursday, August 23, 2007